

PATENT  
10/015,834

REMARKS

The Abstract has been amended to meet Examiner's requirements.

Applicants recognize that the name, Java should be used in trademark and thus at least capitalized. However, Applicants believe that they done so with their initial capitalization of the term throughout the specification. However, should the Examiner feel that full capitalization of Java is more appropriate, Applicants will do so.

New claims 28, 29, and 30 present allowed claims 6, 14, and 22 in independent form.

New claims 28, 29, and 30 have been added to respectively present allowed claims 6, 14, and 22 in independent form, and to replace these cancelled dependent claims. Thus, it is submitted that these claims and claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23, and 24 which respectively depend from these allowed independent claims are now in condition for allowance.

Examiner's Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner for the telephone interview granted to their Attorney on May 25, 2005. In this interview, Attorney attempted to point out that the primary reference, the Schmidt et al. (US6,546,554) is not an anticipatory reference under 35 USC 102. In order to reject under 35 USC 102, the reference must teach every element of the invention without modification. Applicants submitted that Schmidt does not do this. Applicants pointed out that the present invention claims cover the combination of the present invention. The key to the present invention is the use of a Hypertext Markup Language document e.g. Web document which has embedded in the document program applets

AUS20010966US1

13

PATENT  
10/015,834

for accessing Application programs and embedded applets for  
accessing a program for installing the Application programs.  
As will be set forth hereinafter, Schmidt does not disclose  
any HTML Web documents containing both applets for accessing  
application programs and installation programs for the  
application programs. Schmidt's Web document at the server  
at the very least does not include an embedded applet for  
accessing an installation program. The Examiner made the  
point that the helper application 340 actually functioned as  
an applet for accessing an installation program. However,  
it was Applicants' position that even if this helper  
application performed this applet function, it was not in  
the Web document at the server 50 but was always at the  
client 10. Thus, this is not teaching every element of the  
invention without modification as required by 35 U.S.C. 102.

**Applicants' Argument:**

Claims 1-5, 9-13, 17-21, and 25-27 are not anticipated under  
35 USC 102(b) by Schmidt et al. US6.546.554.

Schmidt is not an anticipatory reference under 35 USC  
102. In order to reject under 35 USC 102, the reference  
must teach every element of the invention without  
modification. Applicants submit that Schmidt does not do  
this.

The present invention requires a server at which there  
is stored a Hypertext Markup Language or Web document in  
which there is embedded both program applets for accessing  
application programs and embedded applets for accessing a  
program for installing the Application programs. Schmidt  
does not use or disclose such an Hypertext Markup language  
document. The Examiner points to column 4, lines 50-60, and  
Fig. 3 in support of his rejection. However, this section

AUS20010966US1

14

PATENT  
10/015,834

does not teach embedding the applet for accessing the installation program in the HTML or Web document. The Examiner may have an argument that applet 350 accompanies, and thus may be considered part of the HTML file 320 which is sent from server 50 to client 10. However, applet 350 is at best an applet for accessing the application program to be installed but not for accessing the installation program. It would appear from the teaching of Schmidt that the installation program is helper application 340 which is always at the client 10, and there is never a need for an applet for accessing the installation program in the HTML Web document 320 being sent from server 50 to client 10. In the interview described above, the Examiner made the point that the helper application 340 actually functioned as an applet for accessing an installation program. However, it was Applicants' position that even if this helper application performed this applet function, it was not in the Web document at the server 50 but was always at the client 10.

AUS20010966US1

15

AUS20010966US1

16